

REMARKS

Claims 1-74 are pending with claims 1, 27 and 52 being the independent claims.

In the Official Action, dated November 16, 2005, claims 1-13, 16-39, 42-64 and 67-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 5,577,250 (Anderson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,642 (Duruoz). Claims 14-15, 40-41 and 65-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Anderson in view of Duruoz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,777 (Hendler).

As discussed previously, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves.

The Official Action asserts in paragraph 6 of the Official Action (on page 4) that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson and Duruoz since buffering commands *instead of requiring immediate execution* allows the host processor to continue in other tasks without waiting for the coprocessor to complete its commands. This allows other tasks with hard deadlines to be completed on time, creating a pipelined system of processing that allows more tasks to be serviced in the same period of time.”

Applicants respectfully clarify that the above-bolded phrase mistakenly led Applicants to believe the Examiner was referring to Anderson since Anderson is the root reference, the deficiency of which is purportedly being cured by the addition of Duruoz. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully retreat from the previous remarks to the extent based on such misunderstanding.

However, Applicants respectfully submit and maintain that Anderson and Duruoz are not properly combinable in the manner suggested in the Official Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103. This is because all of Anderson's DSP Task Units are required to adhere to a pre-defined particular structure that is not believed to be generalizable.

As described in Anderson, "DSP programmers *must* document some basic information about each program unit. Such information would be included in a DSP Task Unit Specification Document. With such a DSP Task Unit Specification Document, the host application programmer would have the required information for writing a host application. The basic information would include task unit identifier information, I/O buffer definition information and control and parameter format and function and a brief description of the functions provided the DSP Task Unit." Col. 9, lines 31-43.

It is not clear, to say the least, how the structure imposed by the DSP Task Unit Specification Document of Anderson could be rewritten for a general command buffer framework. To the contrary, Anderson describes setting "active/inactive" flags for enabling and disabling the DSP Task Units in conjunction with other information contained in the DSP Task Unit data structure. Col. 9, lines 1-9. Applicants thus fail to appreciate how these extensive requirements of the system of Anderson could be accommodated simultaneously with the command buffers described in Duruoz. Duruoz certainly describes no such ways, or interchangeabilities between systems.

Since, as described above, Applicants disagree that Anderson can be combined with Duruoz in the manner suggested by the invention due to lack of interchangeability of the pre-defined DSP Task Unit structure of Anderson and the command buffers of Duruoz,

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0742/177739.01
Application No.: 10/039,036
Office Action Dated: November 16, 2005

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and submit that Claims 1-23, 27-49 and 52-74 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: January 17, 2006



Thomas E. Watson
Registration No. 43,243

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439